

REMARKS

Claims 1 and 10-12 are pending in the present application. Claims 3-7 were previously withdrawn and claims 2, 8 and 9 were previously canceled. Claims 1, 10 and 12 are herein amended. Applicants respectfully submit that this Amendment is fully responsive to the Office Action dated November 14, 2006.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC §112

Claims 10 and 12 were rejected under 35 USC §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. To expedite prosecution and clarify the subject matter of the present invention, Applicants hereby amend claims 10 and 12. In view of these amendments, Applicants respectfully submit that this rejection is now moot and should be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC §102

Claims 1 and 10-12 were rejected under 35 USC §102(e) as anticipated by *Goodman et al.* (U.S. Pat. No. 6,454,865). However, for at least the following reasons, Applicants respectfully disagree with the basis for this rejection.

Briefly, anticipation requires the disclosure in a single prior art reference of each and EVERY element of the claimed invention, arranged as in the claim. Here, *Goodman et al.* does NOT teach or suggest a susceptor comprising *a gas supply channel having a first opening passing through from a rear surface of the susceptor to the wafer pocket, and a first groove formed on the rear surface of the susceptor and extended from a periphery of the rear surface of*

the susceptor to the first opening and having a shape adapted to supply a gas into the wafer pocket as the susceptor rotates in a predetermined direction. Instead, as shown in Fig. 36 of *Goodman*, the conduits 270e do NOT have a shape of “groove”, but have a shape of a “hole” that passes through the element 200e. Further, the conduits 270e do not have a shape which is “adapted to supply a gas into the wafer pocket as the susceptor rotates in a predetermined direction”.

Further, in the configuration of Fig. 36 of *Goodman*, the spider posts 64 are necessary to supply gas into the susceptor. Whereas, in the present invention, for example, gas existing on the rear surface of the susceptor is automatically lead into the susceptor as the susceptor rotates. Therefore, such an element as spider posts is not required in the present invention, whereby the device becomes simpler.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the *Goodman* conduits 270e do NOT correspond to the groove recited in claims 1 and 11 of the present application (e.g., *Goodman* does NOT disclose EVERY element of the claimed invention). Thus, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the anticipation rejection of claims 1 and 10-12.

Conclusion

In view of the aforementioned amendments and accompanying remarks, Applicants submit that the claims, as herein amended, are in condition for allowance. Applicants request such action at an early date.

If the Examiner believes that this application is not now in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to contact Applicants' undersigned attorney to arrange for an interview to expedite the disposition of this case.

If this paper is not timely filed, Applicants respectfully petition for an appropriate extension of time. The fees for such an extension or any other fees that may be due with respect to this paper may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-2866.

Respectfully submitted,

WESTERMAN, HATTORI, DANIELS & ADRIAN, LLP



Dayrin A. Auito
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 56,024
Telephone: (202) 822-1100
Facsimile: (202) 822-1111

DAA/mra